REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 29, 2010, considered and rejected claims 1-30. Claims 1-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Beaumont* et al. (U.S. Publ. No. 2004/0073511) in view of *Burke* (U.S. Patent No. 5,423,041). Claim 30 is pending and rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Beaumont.*

By this response, independent claim 1 has been amended, and independent claims 31 and 39 have been added to better clarify that the invention is directed to embodiments which display business rules in a tree structure. Figure 2 provides an example of the type of tree structure the invention encompasses. As seen in this figure, the conditions and actions of a rule are divided into separate nodes. A first node represents the conditions of the rule while a second node represents the actions of the rule. A rule is constructed by adding sub-nodes to the first node that define logical relationships (i.e. AND, OR, and NOT relationships) that apply to conditions of the sub-node. Figure 2 shows three sub-nodes: an AND node at a first level of the tree structure, a NOT node at a second level (i.e. as a condition of the AND relationship), and an OR node at a third level (i.e. as a condition of the NOT relationship). By structuring business rules in this manner, the invention greatly simplifies the process of creating and editing business rules.

Claim 1, which is directed to a system, has been amended to state that the rule is displayed "in a tree structure, the tree structure including a first node for the conditions of the rule and a second node for the actions of the rule, wherein the first node includes one or more sub-nodes that each define either an AND, OR, or NOT logical relationship." Claims 31 and 39, which are directed to a method and a computer storage medium respectively, each contain the same limitations and define the process of creating the tree structure including: "receiving user input that selects a first logical relationship to add to the first node of the tree structure, the first logical relationship comprising one of an AND, OR, or NOT logical relationship; creating a first sub-node under the first node of the tree structure that defines the first logical relationship; receiving user input that specifies one or more conditions to add to the first sub-node; adding the one or more conditions to the first sub-node; receiving user input that specifies one or more actions of the business rule; and adding the actions to the second node of the tree structure."

In each of these claims, it now clearly states that the business rule is arranged in a tree structure including nodes for the conditions and rules, and sub-nodes under the conditions node for defining the logical relationships and the conditions to which these apply. In view of these

amendments, Applicant submits that the claims are novel and non-obvious in view of the cited art.

Beaumont, the primary reference, is directed to embodiments, similar to the invention, for creating business rules. However, Beaumont does not disclose that the business rules can be arranged in a tree structure as now claimed. For example, as best shown in figure 1, Beaumont provides a user interface that is used to define rules. These rules are If-Then statements that produce an action when the condition statement is satisfied. *See* ¶ 28. However, Beaumont does not structure the rules using a tree structure as required by the claims. In contrast, Beaumont provides a table display that includes a column for the arguments, the conditional operators 110 (i.e. <, >, =, etc.) and the condition conjugates 112 (i.e. the logical relationships AND, OR, and NOT). This table display does not constitute "a tree structure, the tree structure including a first node for the conditions of the rule and a second node for the actions of the rule, wherein the first node includes one or more sub-nodes that each define either an AND, OR, or NOT logical relationship;" as required by claim.

Similarly, the table display is not created by: "displaying, on a display device of a computer, a tree structure having a first node for defining conditions of a business rule, and second node for defining actions to be taken when the conditions of the business rule are satisfied; receiving user input that selects a first logical relationship to add to the first node of the tree structure, the first logical relationship comprising one of an AND, OR, or NOT logical relationship; creating a first sub-node under the first node of the tree structure that defines the first logical relationship; receiving user input that specifies one or more conditions to add to the first sub-node; adding the one or more conditions to the first sub-node; receiving user input that specifies one or more actions of the business rule; and adding the actions to the second node of the tree structure;" as required by claims 31 and 39. Therefore, Beaumont fails to teach or suggest each limitation of the independent claims.

Burke, on the other hand, was only cited as teaching the aspects of the claims related to natural language inline editing, and does not disclose anything relevant to displaying business rules in a tree structure as now emphasized by the claims. Therefore, Burke likewise fails to teach or suggest these aspects of the claims. Applicant therefore submits that the combination of references fails to teach or suggest each limitation of the independent claims and respectfully requests that the rejections be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 322-8427.

Dated this 16th day of June, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

/BRIAN D. TUCKER/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
BRIAN D. TUCKER
Registration No. 61,550
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:BDT:cj
2573311_1